UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

District of Minnesota

United States of America				
Jamelle Davon Shoals)) Case No: 08cr232(12) (MJD/AJB)	
)	
D		11/10/2000	ń) USM No: 14063-041
Date of Original Judgment:		11/18/2009)	Katherine Menendez, Office of the Federal
Date of Previous Amended Judgment:)	Defender
(Use Date of Last Amended Judgment if Any)				Defendant's Attorney
ORDER REGARDING MOTION FOR SENTENCE REDUCTION				
PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2)				
Upon motion of the defendant □ the Director of the Bureau of Prisons □ the court under 18 U.S.C. \$ 3582(c)(2) for a reduction in the term of imprisonment imposed based on a guideline sentencing range that has subsequently been lowered and made retroactive by the United States Sentencing Commission pursuant to 28 U.S.C. \$ 994(u), and having considered such motion, and taking into account the policy statement set forth at USSG §1B1.10 and the sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), to the extent that they are applicable,				
IT IS ORDERED that the motion is:				
				ously imposed sentence of imprisonment (as reflected in
the last judgment issued) of	48	m	ionti	nths is reduced to 46
I. COURT DETERMINATION OF GUIDELINE RANGE (Prior to Any Departures) Previous Offense Level: 27 Amended Total Offense Level: 23				
Criminal History Category:	I	-		ninal History Category: I
Previous Guideline Range: 70-87 Amended Guideline Range: 46-57				
H. SENTENCE RELATIVE TO THE AMENDED GUIDELINE RANGE				
▼ The reduced sentenced is within the amended guideline range.				
☐ The previous term of imprisonment imposed was less than the guideline range applicable to the defendant at the time of sentencing as a result of a substantial assistance departure or Rule 35 reduction, and the reduced sentence is comparably less than the amended guideline range. ☐ The reduced sentence is above the amended guideline range.				
II. ADDITIONAL COMM				
establishing the offense level of its previous factual decision	I. <u>United States v. Ad</u> ons intact when decid ort at the original time	ams, 104 F.3d ing whether to of sentencing	102 app g, the	previous determination" regarding the amount of drugs 028, 1030 (8th Cir. 1997). The Court must "leave all apply a guideline retroactively." <u>Id.</u> at 1031. Based on the Court concludes that there is no basis to hold
Except as otherwise provided, all provisions of the judgment dated 11/18/2009 shall remain in effect.				
IT IS SO ORDERED. Order Date:	1-10-12			Muhalt. C
				Judge's signature
Effective Date:	(if different from order	(data)		Michael J. Davis, Chief Judge, D. Minn. Printed name and title

(if different from order date)